Published in: Papers in Linguistics Volume 1 Editor G.K. Panikkar, International School of Dravidian Linguistics, Thiruvananthapuram 2023: 205-228.

TAXONOMY OF CAUSATIVIZATION IN TAMIL

Rajendran Sankaravelayuthan

Abstract

Causativization in Tamil is mainly of two types, causativization by morphological process such as addition of suffixes and phonological changes in the stem and causativization by auxiliary verbs (periphrastic causativization). The auxiliary verb cey 'do', vai_1 'put', aTi 'beat', taTTu 'beat', viTu 'leave, pooTu 'put' vai_2 compound with the infinitive form of a main verb to express causation. The verbs cey, vai_1, aTi and taTTu express strong causation and the verbs viTu, pooTu and vai_2 express week causation. Usually, the periphrastic causativiation denote a general causative situation where as their counter part by morphological process denote a specific causative situation.

1. Introduction

A wider definition of causativization covering all the aspects of causation appears to be impossible. But there are narrower definitions which cover certain aspects of caustivization. The following definitions can reveal the essence of causativization or causative formation.

1. In linguistics, a causative (abbreviated caus) is a valency-increasing operation that indicates that a subject either causes someone or something else to do or be something or causes a change in state of a non-volitional event. Normally, it brings in a new argument (the causer), A, into a transitive clause, with the original subject S becoming the object O. (Wikipedia on "Causative")

2. Causativization is a universal phenomenon of language that occurs in various ways and processes. It involves two arguments where one influences the other to carry out the event implied by the predicate. That is, the event would not take place if the causer did not coerce the causee.

3. Causativization involves a relation between two verbs - a "simple" (non-causative) verb and a causative verb. This relation touches on three domains of linguistic theory: the lexicon, the syntax, and morphology. The relation between the two verbs is both lexical and syntactic, and in some languages such as Hebrew, it is reflected in the morphology as well. While the process of causativization is universal, languages differ with respect to the type of causative verbs they have, and the range of verbs they allow to undergo causativization. (Arad 2000)

As we understand, the ways in which the languages manifest causation differ. Most of the languages have specific or lexical causative forms (such as English rise → raise, lie → lay, sit → set). Some languages use morphological devices (such as inflection) that change verbs into their causative forms (as in the case of Tamil: uruku 'melt', *urukku* 'cause to melt', *uRangku* 'sleep', *uRakku* 'cause to sleep'). Other languages employ periphrasis, with control verbs or auxiliary verbs. (as in Tamil: *tuungku* 'sleep', *tuungkac*-cey 'cause to sleep'). There tends to be a link between how "compact" a causative device is and its semantic meaning.

mezuku uruk-iy-atu
wax melt-PAS-3NS
'The wax melted'
raaNi mezuk-ai uruk-k-in-aaL
Rani wax-ACC melt-CAU-PAS-3FS
Kuzandtai uRang-i-yatu

Child sleep-PAS-3NS

'The child slept'

raaNi kuzantai-yai uRangk-a-cey-t-aaL

Rani child-ACC sleep-INF-do-PAS-3FS

'Rani made the child to sleep'

The causer is the new argument in a causative construction that causes the action to be done and the causer is the new argument brought into the causative construction derived from the non-causative construction. In the example sentences given above, Rani is the causer. The causee is the argument that actually does the action in a causativized sentence. It is usually present in both the underlying and derived sentences. In the above examples mezuku 'wax' and kuzantai 'child' are the causee. It is usually present in both the underlying and derived sentences. The sentences *mezuku urukiyatu* 'The wax melted' and kuzantai *tuungkiyatu* 'The child slept' are the underlying sentences. Often, these underlying sentences may not be explicitly stated. They have also been called the base situations. A derived sentence would be the causativized variant of the underlying sentence: *raaNi mezukai urukkinaaL* 'Rani melted the wax', *raaNi kuzantaiyai tuungkacceytaaL* 'Rani made the child to sleep'

2. Different perspectives on causativization

There are different types of perspectives available in the typological study of causativiation. In the study on causativization, the perspectives of Comrie (1981), Song (1996, Dixon (2000), Sibathani (2001), and Talmy (2000) are important. The perspective of Comrie, Sibathani, and Talmy are discussed below. Their perspectives give us broader understanding of causativitation.

Perspective of Shibathani

Shibatani (2001) lists three criteria for entities and relations that must be encoded in linguistic expressions of causation: An agent causing or forcing another participant to perform an action, or to be in a certain condition

(1) The relation between [the] two events [=the causing event, and the caused performing/being event] is such that the speaker believes that the occurrence of one event, the "caused event," has been realized at t2, which is after t1, the time of the "causing event"

(2) The relation between causing event and caused event is such that the speaker believes the occurrence of the caused event depends wholly on the occurrence of the causing event—the dependency of the two events here must be to the extent that it allows the speaker a counterfactual inference that the caused event would not have taken place at a particular time if the causing event had not taken place, provided that all else had remained the same.

This set of definitional prerequisites allows for a broad set of types of relationships based, at least, on the lexical verb, the semantics of the causer, the semantics of the causee and the semantics of the construction explicitly encoding the causal relationship.

Perspective of Comrie

Bernard Comrie (1981) focuses on the typology of the syntax and semantics of causative constructions proper. Crucially, Comrie (and others to be discussed here) distinguish between the linguistic encoding of causal relations and other extra-linguistic concerns such as the nature of causation itself and questions of how humans perceive of causal relations. While certainly not irrelevant, these

extra-linguistic questions will, for now, be left aside. Comrie usefully characterizes causative events in terms of two (or more) microevents perceived of composing a macroevent, and encoded in a single expression (of varying size and form). Formally, he categorizes causatives into 3 types, depending on the contiguity of the material encoding the causing event and that encoding the caused event. These are: 1) lexical causatives, in which the two events are expressed in a single lexical item, as in the well-discussed case of English kill; 2) morphological causatives, in which the causing event and the caused event are encoded in a single verbal complex via causative morphology, and, prototypically, morphological marking showing the status of affected arguments. Finally, Comrie discusses analytic causatives, in which the causing event and the caused event are encoded in separate clauses.

Perspectives of Talmy

Leonard Talmy (2000) conducts an in-depth investigation of different types of causal relations. His list of possible (semantic) causative types with examples are interesting:

- autonomous events (non-causative): The vase broke.
- resulting-event causation: The vase broke from a ball's rolling into it.
- causing-event causation: A ball's rolling into it broke the vase.
- instrument causation: A ball broke the vase.
- author causation (unintended): I broke the vase in rolling a ball into it.
- agent causation (intended): I broke the vase by rolling a ball into it.
- undergoer situation (non-causative): My arm broke (on me) when I fell.

- self-agentive causation: I walked to the store.
- caused agency (inductive causation) I sent him to the store.

3. Manifestations of causativization in Tamil

Rajendran (1979) makes note of different types of causative formation in Tamil. Causativization in Tamil is manifested at least in two different ways: morphological causativation and periphrastic causativization. There is always a periphrastic counterpart to the morphological causative form.

3.1. Morphological causation

The caustivization in Tamil can be understood by the change in the morphological form of the non-causative verb. This is explicated by the addition of an argument which is instrumental in causing the action denoted by underlying intransitive or transitive verb and the additional causative meaning. Not all the transitive verbal forms derived from the intransitive verbal forms lead to the causative interpretation of 'cause to V'. But one can deduce some causative interpretation from the transitive formations. As we understand, causativization is morpho-syntactic and semantic process. The resultant meaning of causation by morphological process is not simply 'cause to V' and one can expect some amount of idiosyncrasy in the resultant meaning of the causative verb. There could be many idiosyncratic extensions of the causative meaning as one can note by referring a dictionary. Morphologically causativized forms are derived from their non-causative counterpart at least in three ways: (1) by suffixation (2) by changing the phonological form or the intransitive verb and (3) by choosing different tense suffixes. It is difficult to say which types of verbs select one among the three possibilities. Only the native speakers can intuitively make causation and its resultant interpretation. The causative formation seems to be arbitrary.

Causative formation by suffixation

The suffixes *-ppi, -pi, -vi, -ttu, -attu, uttu, -ttu, -ccu* etc. are suffixed with certain intransitive verbs to form causative verbs. The following is the list of causative formations making use of the set *ppi, pi* and *vi*.

paTi 'study, learn'	- paTi-ppi 'cause to study/educate'
kuLi 'take bath'	- kuLi-ppi 'bathe'
kaaN 'see'	- kaaN-pi 'show'
cey 'do'	- cey-vi 'cause to do'

From the examples given above we can understand that the causative verbs formed by suffixation is not always 'cause to V". The meanings of the causative verbs by suffixation are idiosyncratic and unpredictable. The causative verb *paTippi* can be used in the following context in which the meaning of the causative form is 'to educate'.

raajaa tan makan-ai emee varai paTi-ppi-tt-aan
Raja his son-ACC MA upto study-CAU-PAS-3MS
'Raja educated his son up to MA'

The periphrastic courter part of paTi-ppi is paTikka-vai and it can replace suffixal formation as shown in the following example.

raajaa tan makan-ai emee varai paTikka-vai-tt-aan
Raja his son-ACC MA upto study-CAUV-PAS-3MS
'Raja educated his son up to MA'

The suffix *-pi* forms a causative verbal form with some amount of idiosyncratic interpretation.

avaL tan kuzantai-kku cantiran-aik kaaN-pi-tt-aaL
she his child-DAT moon-ACC see-CAU-PAA-3FS
'She showed her child the moon'

The causative suffix -pi is found in a few more causative formations. The form *kaR-pi* 'cause to learn, teach' is derived from kal 'learn' by the addition of the causative suffix -pi and *kaaNpi* 'show' is the causative form of *kaaN* 'see' formed by the addition of the causative suffix -pi to kaaN. There is one more causative form of kaaN 'see', that is kaaTTu formed by the addition of Tu. The form *kaaTTu* 'show' is preferred to *kaaNPi* 'show' in the written variety. The periphrastic counterparts of cey-vi are cey-a-vai 'cause to do' and cey-a-ccey 'cause to do'. They can replace the morphological causative form ceyvi as exemplified in the following examples.

raajaa avaL-ai-kkoNTu anta veelaiy-aic cey-vi-tt-aan
Raja she-ACC-INS that work do-CAU-PAS-3MS
'Raja made her to do that work'
raajaa avaLaik koNTu anta veelaiyaic cey-a-vai-tt-aan
Raja she-ACC by that work do-INF-CAUV-PAS-3MS
'Raja made her to do that work'

There is another set of causative suffixes: -attu, -uttu and -ttu. The following is the list of causative verbs from these suffixes.

vaa~var	'come'	- var-attu 'cause to come'
cel 'go'		- cel-uttu 'send (as arrow, missile, etc.)
vizu 'fall'		- viiz-ttu 'cause to fall'
uyar 'be raised'		- uyar-ttu 'raise'
taaz 'be lowered'		- taaz-ttu 'lower, bring down'
paay 'flow'		- paay-ccu 'irrigate'kaay 'become hot'
		- kaay-ccu 'heat'

Similar to the causative formation by the addition of the first set of causative suffixes, the second set of causative suffixes -attu,

uttu -ttu and -ccu also show some amount of idiosyncrasy in the formation of causative verbs and the resultant meanings cannot be glossed over always as ‘cause to V’. The suffix -attu is rarely used in causative formation. The causative form *varattu* ‘cause to come’ shows some idiosyncratic meaning.

avan tinamum viiTTu-kku ceytittaaL var-attu-kiR-aan
he daily house-DAT newspaper come-CAU-PRE-3MS
‘He is causing the newspaper to arrive his house daily’

The suffix -ttu form causative forms with a number of intransitive verbal bases: uNar ‘wake up’: uNar-ttu ‘cause to wake up’, ular ‘become dry’: ualar-ttu ‘cause to become dry’, uNar ‘become concious’: uNarttu ‘kaTa ‘cross, go past’: kaTa-ttu ‘kidnap, smuggle’, kiTa ‘lie down’: kiTattu ‘cause to lie down’, paTar ‘spread like a creeper’ : paTar-ttu ‘cause to spread’, puku ‘enter’: puku-ttu ‘cause to enter; nakar ‘move’: nakar-ttu ‘cause to move’, vaLar ‘grow’: vaLar-ttu ‘cause to grow, bring up’, vaaz ‘live’: vaaz-ttu ‘bless’.

maangkaay maratt-ilirundtu vizu-nt-atu
mango tree-from fall-PAS-3NS
“Mango fell down from the tree’
avan maangkaay-ai kal eRi-ndtu viiz-tt-in-aan
he mango-ACC stone throw-PPAR fall-CAU-3MS
‘He felled the mango by throwing a stone’

As we have already noted, not all the transitive verbal formation from the intransitive verbal forms lead to the causative interpretation of ‘cause to V’. The causative form acquires some idiosyncratic meaning as noted in the following examples: kaTa ‘cross, go past’: kaTattu ‘kidnap’, smuggle’, vaaz ‘live’: vaaz-ttu ‘bless’.

avaL caalaiy-aik kaTa-nt-aaL
she road-ACC cross-PAS-3FS
'She crossed the road'
avan tangkatt-ai kaTa-tt-in-aan
he gold-ACC smuggle-PAS-3MS
'He smuggled gold'
avaL cennai-il vaaz-kiR-aaL
she Chennai-loc live-PRE-3FS
'She lives in Chennai'
avar avaLai nanR-aaka iru ena vaaz-tt-inaar
he she-ACC well-ADV be that bless-PAS-3MS
'He blessed him to live long'

The causative verb cel-uttu from cel 'go' by suffixation of uttu. It is not exactly 'cause to go'. It acquires some amount of idiosyncrasy in its causative formation. The following example will illustrate the point.

avan angku cen-R-aan
he there go-PAS-3MS
'He went there'

But the following possible causative counterpart of the above sentence is not there.

*avaL avan-ai viiTTu-kkuc cel-utt-in-aaL
She he-ACC house-DAT go-CAU-PAS-3FS
'She drove him to the house'

But the following sentence is quite possible:

avan avaL miitu ampu cel-utt-in-aan
he she on arrow go-CAU-PAS-3MS
'He sent an arrow towards her'

The -ccu suffixed paay-ccu also show some idiosyncratic meaning.

avar tan vayal-ukku niir paay-cc-in-aar
he his paddy-field-DAT water flow-CAU-3Mzs
'He irrigated his paddy field'

Causative formation by phonological change

Causative stems are formed from their intransitive/non-causative counter parts by certain phonological change. One of the phonological changes could be due to gemination of the final consonant of the intransitive verbal base. The following could be quoted as examples:

-ku > -kku

uruku 'melt': urukku 'cause to melt'; aaku 'become': aakku 'cause to become'; poo~pooku 'go'; pookku 'remove', karuku 'become scorched': karukku 'scorch'

As we noted already not all the transitive verbal formation from the intransitive verbal forms lead to the causative interpretation of 'cause to V'. For example, the following causative construction is not possible:

*avaL avan-ai ankirundtu pook-k-in-aaL
she he-ACC there-from go-CAU-PAS-3FS
'She caused him to go from there'

The causative verb pookku derived from pooku show some amount of idiosyncrasy in its causative meaning as shown by the following example.

tuNiy-il azukku pook-a-villai
cloth-LOC dirt go-INF-not
'The dirt did not get removed from the cloth'
avaL tuNiy-ilirunda azukk-aip pook-k-in-aaL

she cloth-from dirt-ACC go-CAUSE-PAS-3FS

'She removed the dirt from the cloth'

-Tu > -TTu

aaTu 'shake': aaTTu 'cause to shake'; kuuTu 'assemble': kuuTTu 'cause to assemble'; kuuTu 'increase' : kuuTTu 'cause to increase'; ooTu 'run' : ooTTu 'chase away, drive', vaaTu 'wither as a plant': vaaTTu 'roast or fry flesh or vegetable in flame' . The causative form ooTTu also show some amount of idiosyncrasy in its causative meaning. The causative ooTTu is used do denote 'drive a vehicle', 'ride a horse', etc.

avaL karupaTTi-il moy-tta iikkaL-ai ooT-T-in-aaL

she jaggery-LOC swarm-ADP flies-ACC run-CAU-PAS-3FS

'She drove away the flies swarmed the jaggery'

avaL kaar ooTT-in-aaL

she car drive-PAS-3FS

'She drove the car'

The causative derived from vaaTu 'wither as a plant', i.e. vaaTTu also shows some idiosyncrasy in its causative meaning as shown in the following example.

ceTi vaaT-iy-atu

plant wither-PAS-3NS

'The plant withered'

avan iRacciy-ai tiiy-il vaTT-in-aan

he flesh-ACC fire-LOC fry-PAS-3MS

'He fried the flesh in the fire'

-Ru > -RRu

The change of R into RR is attested in the following formations: maaRu ‘change’: maaRRu ‘change’, eeRu ‘climb up, be loaded’: eeRRu ‘load’, aaRu ‘become cold’ > aaRRu ‘cause to become cold’. One should always remember that there is always some amount of idiosyncrasy in the resultant meaning of the causative formations and also that there are always lexical gaps in the formation of the causative forms.

avaL bass-il eeR-in-aaL

She bus-LOC climb-PAS-3FS

‘She boarded the bus’

avan bass-il eeR-R-i viT-Tu va-nt-aan

he bus-LOC climb-CAU-ADVP leave-PPAR come-PAS-3MS

He came back after having her boarded the bus’

avan arici muuTTaikaL-ai vaNTi-yil eeR-R-in-aan

he rice sacks-ACC cart-LOC climb-CAU-PAS-3MS

‘He loaded the rice sacks in the cart’

-ngku > -kku

There is another type of phonological change in the formation of causative forms from the intransitive forms. The intransitive verbs with the final Nasal-Stop cluster change into Stop-Stop cluster by the densalization of the homorganic nasal phoneme in the causative formation. This can be seen in the following examples:

curungku ‘become reduced’: iTungku ‘become narrow’, iTukku : oTungku ‘be subdued’: oTukku ‘subdue’, kalangku ‘become turbid’: kalakku ‘cause to become turbid’, kulungku ‘shake’: kulukku ‘shake’, curungku ‘become reduced: curukku ‘reduce’, taangku ‘bear (beating, etc.): taakku ‘attack’, teengku ‘be stagnated as water’: teekku ‘stagnate (water)’, niingku ‘leave’: niikku

‘remove’, nerungku ‘go near’: nerukku ‘press hard’, maTangku ‘fold’: maTakku ‘cause to fold’, muRungku ‘get twisted’: muRukku ‘twist’, viLangku ‘undersand’: viLakku ‘explain’.

As we have already noted, the causative verb forms from the intransitive verbal bases by the phonological is not simply ‘cause to V’. The resultant causative verb always shows some idiosyncratic meaning. Note that the formation of taakku ‘assault’’ from taanku ‘bear (beating, etc.) results in some idiosyncratic meaning.

-mpu > -ppu

nirampu ‘become full’: nirappu ‘fill’, kuumpu ‘be folded’: kuuppu ‘fold’, tirumpu ‘ return’ : tiruppu ‘turn’, kuzampu ‘be confused’: kuzappu ‘confuse’,

There is another type of complex phonological change found in the following causative formation as noted in the following examples.

L > TTu

uruL ‘roll (as a ball, etc.)’: uruTTu ‘cause to roll, make a ball-like thing; puraL ‘roll on (mud, etc): puraTTu ‘smear something by rolling, turn upside down’, curuL ‘curl in as a leaf’: curuTTu ‘roll’; niiL ‘become long’: niiTTu ‘elongate’,

l > RRu

cuzal ‘rotate’: cuzaRRu ‘cause to rotate’, kazal ‘come off, get detached’: kazaRRu ~ kazaTTu ‘unfasten, unhook, unscrew’

-N >-TTu

kaaN~kaN ‘see’: kaaTTu ‘show’, uN ‘eat’: uuTTu ‘feed’

Causative formation by selecting different the tense markers

There are causative verbal forms derived from the intransitive verbal form without addition of a causative suffix or by any kind of phonological change. In these cases, the causative formation can be

understood by the selection of different tense markers. The following examples will illustrate the formation of this type of causative verbs. The past tense suffix is given in the bracket.

muRi-(nt) 'break' - muRi-(tt) 'cause to break i.e, break'

oTi-(nt) 'break' - oTi-(tt) 'cause to break i.e, break'

uTai-(nt) 'break' – uTai-(tt) 'cause to break i.e, break'

kizi-(nt) 'be torn' – kizi-(tt) 'tear'

poT-(nt) 'become power' – poTi-(tt) 'power, grind'

arai-(nt) 'become ground – arai-(tt) 'grind'

cari-(nt) 'lean' - cari-(tt) 'cause to lean'

alai-(nt) 'wander' – alai-(tt) 'cause to wander'

aNai-(nt) 'be put off (as a light) – aNai-(tt) 'put off light'

muTi-(nt) 'be completed' - muTi-(tt) 'complete'

nikaz 'happen' - nikazttu 'conduct'

The following example sentences will illustrate the point mentioned above:

maram muRi-nt-atu
tree break-PAS-3NS
'The tree broke'

avan maratt-ai muRi-tt-aan
he tree-ACC break-PAS-3MS
'He broke the tree'

Causative formation without any suffixation or phonological change or tense change

There are instances where causatives are formed without any suffixation or phonological change or tense change. The verb does not show the above-mentioned formation. The causative formation can be understood only by context or addition of causer. The verb *cintu* 'spill' and piLa 'split' can denote both intransitive and transitive/causative senses without showing any type of above-mentioned explicit formation. The following examples will illustrate the point.

paal taraiy-il cint-iy-atu
milk floor-LOC spill-PAS-3NS
'The milk spilled on the floor'
avan paal-ait taraiy-il cint-in-aan
he milk-ACC floor-LOC spill-PAS-3MS
'He spilled the milk on the floor'
viRaku iraNT-aakap piLa-nt-atu
wood two-ADV split-PAS-3NS
'The fire wood split into two'
avan viRak-ai iraNT-aakap piLa-nt-aan
he fire-wood-ACC two-ADV spit-PAS-3MS
'He spit the fire-wood into two'

Note that there is no morphological change in the formation of the causative *cintu* 'spill'. Only context can tell us whether verbal form is intransitive or causative. This is similar to the English verb *spill*. Similarly, *muuTu* 'close' and *tiRa* 'open' can denote the door being closed and door being opened respectively as well as the causative meaning 'close the door' and 'open the door'.

katavu tiRa-nt-atu
door open-PAS-3NS
'The door opened'
avan katav-ait tiRa-nt-aan
he door-ACC open-PAS-3MS
'He opened the door'

Lexical gap in the morphological causative formation

One can find lexical gaps in the morphological causative formation. For example for kuTi 'drink' the causative formation by adding -ppi could be *kuTippi* 'cause to drink'; instead the periphrastic causative forms *kuTikkaccey* (<*kuTikk*-a 'drink-INF+cey) 'cause to drink' and *kuTikkavai* (kuTikka+ vai 'keep') 'cause to drink' are available. Similarly, for *paya* 'be afraid' the periphrastic causative form *payapaTuttu* which the causative form *payappaTu* 'become afraid' is available. The form *payappaTuttu* is a combination of *payam* 'fear' and *paTuttu* 'cause to suffer'. For the non-causative form *maaL* 'die', there is no causative form *maaTTu* which can mean 'cause to die'. The verb *nikaz* 'happen, occur' has its causative form *nikazttu* 'conduct', but its synonym *campavi* 'happen, occur' does not have morphological causative form. This list can increase.

Suppletive or lexical causation

People may consider kol 'kill' as the suppletive or lexical causative form of caaku 'to die'.

3.2. Periphrastic causativization

In addition to morphological causativization, Tamil uses a periphrastic (or analytic) construction to express causation which typically includes two verbs and two clauses. English causatives prototypically use *make* (but other verbs such as cause, order,

allow, force, compel can be used) in the main clause with the lexical verb in a subordinate clause, as in "I made him go." Tamil makes use of a number of verbs to bring out causation. The auxiliary verbs cey 'do', vai_1 'keep', aTi 'beat', taTTu 'beat', and azai 'call' form strong periphrastic causative verbs when added with infinitive forms of certain verbs. The verbs viTu 'leave', pooTu and vai_2 form week causative verbs when added with inventive form of certain verbs. Note that the auxiliary vai has to be divided into two, vai1 and vai2 as the first one is used to express strong causativization and the second one is used to express weak causativization.

Strong periphrastic causativization

(1) V-INF+cey 'do'

The typical causative verb is cey 'do' which gives the interpretation 'cause to, make to'. The periphrastic causative formation is formed from the non-causative verb by adding the causativizing verb to the infinitive form of the non-cusative verb. The following are the few instances of periphrastic causation.

uRangku 'sleep: uRangk-a-ccey 'cause to sleep

peecu 'speak': peec-a-c cey 'cause to talk'

ooTu 'run': ooT-a-ccey 'cause to run

Note that uRangk-a is the infinitive form of the intransitive verb uRangku 'sleep' and peec-a is the infinitive form of peecu 'speak'.

(2) V-INF + vai 'keep'

Another important causative verb is vai_1 'keep'. The verb vai_1 combines with infinitive forms of certain intransitive verbs to form periphrastic causative verbs.

veeku 'cook': veekavai 'cause to cook'

tuungku 'sleep': tuungkavai 'cause to sleep'

paaTu ‘sing’: paaTavai ‘cause to sing’

uuRu ‘be soaked’: uuRavai ‘soak’

viLangku ‘be understood’: viLangkavai ‘cause to understand’.

(3) V-INF + aTi ‘beat’

The verb aTi ‘beat’ combines with infinitive forms of certain intransitive to form periphrastic causative verbs.

caaku ‘die’: caak-aTi ‘cause to die’; nooku ‘feel pain’: nookaTi ‘cause to feel pain; pookkaTi ‘cause to go’, naaRu ‘smell bad’: naaRaTi ‘cause to become bad’, muzku ‘immerse’ muzkaTi ‘cause to immerse’

(4) V-INF + azai ‘call’

The azai ‘call’ too form periphrastic causative formation with vaa~varu ‘come’.

’vaa~var ‘come’: varavazai ‘cause to come’.

(3) V-INF + taTTu ‘beat’

The verb taTTu forms causative verbs by combining with certain verbs in infinitive forms.

avan maankaayai viz-a-taTT-in-aan

he mango-ACC fall-INF-beat

‘He felled the mango’

Weak periphrastic causativization

There are verbs of causation or caustivizers with lesser force of causativization used in periphrastic causation. They are viTu ‘leave’, pooTu ‘put’, vai_2 ‘keep’ and tuuNTu ‘provoke’ The following examples will illustrate the point.

avaL kuuntal-ai ular-a-viT-T-aaL

she hair-ACC dry-INF-leave-PAS-3FS

'She let her hair dry'

avaL avan-ai uLLee var-a-viT-T-aaL

she he-ACC inside come-INF-leave-PAS-3FS

'She let him come inside'

avaL tuNiy-aik kaay-a-ppooT-T-aaL

she cloth-ACC dry-INF-put-PAS-3FS

'She put the cloth to dry'

raaNi mizakaay-ai kaay-a-vai-tt-aaL

Rani chili -ACC dry-INF-keep-PAA-3FS

'Rani let the chilli to dry'

raajaa avan-aik kuTikk-a-ttuuNT-in-aan

Raja he-ACC drink-INF-provoke-PAS-3MS

'Raja provoked him to drink.

Certain deverbal nominal + *aaTTu* 'shake'

The deverbal nominals such as kuLippu 'bathing' (the deverbal nominal form of kuLi 'take bath') uRakku (the deverbal nominal form of uRangku 'sleep' and collocates with the causative verb aaTTu 'shake' form periphrastic causative verbs: kuLippu + aTTu > kuLippaaTTu; uRakku + aaTTu > uRakkaaTTu 'cause to sleep'.

kuzantai kuLi-tt-atu

child bathe-PAA-3NS

'The child batherd'

avaL kuzantaiy-ai kuLipp-aaTT-in-aan

she child-ACC bathing-CAU-PAST-3MS

'She bathed the child'

kuzantai uRang-iy-atu

child sleep-PAS-3NS

'The child slept'

avaL kuzantaiy-ai uRakk-aaTT-in-aan

she child-ACC sleep-CAU-PAS-3MS

'She caused the child to sleep'

This is not a productive formation.

Certain nominal forms + aakku 'cause to become'

With certain nouns which could be considered as the object of the causative sentence the verb aakku (which is the transitive verb of its intransitive counterpart aaku 'become') forms many types of causative constructions.

raajaa tan kaTikaarattai nall-aak-k-in-aan

Raja his clock good-become-CAU-PAS-3FS

'Raja repaired his clock'

The causativising verb *aakku* combines with a number of nouns to form compound verbs which gives causative force to the resultant verbs. The examples of such compound formations are: cuuTaakku 'heat' (cuuTu 'hotness' + aakku), kuurmaiyaakku (> kuurmai 'sharpness' + aakku) 'sharpen, tuNTaakku (<tuNTu 'piece' + aakku).

avaL paal-aic cut-aak-k-in-aaL

she milk-ACC hot-become-CAU-PAS-3FS

'She heated the milk'

avan kattiyai kuurmaiy-aak-k-in-aan

he knife sharpness-become-CAU-PAS-3MS

'He sharpened the knife'

raajaa kaTTaiy-ait iraNT-aakat tuNT-aak-k-in-aan

Raja wood-ACC two-ADV piece-become-CAU-3MS

'Raja cut the wood into two pieces'

Note that the *cuuTu* 'hotness', *kuurmai* 'sharpness' and *tuNTu* 'piece' are not the objects of the verb *aakku*. In all these cases, *aakku* functions as a verbalizer converting the previous noun into a verb.

Certain nominal form + paTuttu

With certain nominal forms paTuttu 'cause to suffer can form periphrastic causative forms:

koopam 'anger' + paTuttu > kooppaTuttu 'cause to become angery'

payam 'fear' + paTuttu 'cause to suffer' > payapTuttu 'cause to become afraid'

tunpam 'suffering' + paTuttu > tunpappaTuttu 'cause to suffer'

But it should be noted that there are parallel intransitive forms formed by the intransitive form *paTu* of *paTuttu* for the above mentioned periphrastic causative forms: *koopappaTu* 'become angry', *payappaTu* 'become afraid', *tunpappaTu* 'suffer'.

Certain nominal forms + uRuttu

uRuttu 'cause to happen' forms periphrastic causative forms with certain nouns. The following are the examples:

tunpu 'suffering' + uRuttu > tunpuRuttu 'cause to suffer, torment'

payam 'fear' + uRuttu > payamuRuttu 'cause to fear, threaten'

accu 'fear' + uRuttu > accuRuttu 'cause to fear, threaten'

ninaivu 'rememberance'+ uRuttu > ninaivuRittu 'cause to remember'

aRivu 'knowledge' + uRuttu > aRivuRuttu 'instruct, advise'

vaRpu + uRuttu > vaRpuRuttu ‘compel’

The transitive verb uRuttu ‘cause’ has *uRu* ‘happen’ as its intransitive counterpart. Interestingly, the parallel intransitive form for *tunpuRu* is again a combination of nominal *tunpu* + *uRu* ‘suffer’ > *tunpuRu* ‘suffer’. But there is no parallel intransitive **payamuRu* ‘fear’, **accuRu* ‘fear’, **ninaivuRu* ‘become conscious’ and **aRivuRu* ‘become instructed’. They can be considered as morphological gaps. For *maykkam-uRu* ‘become unconscious’, there is no parallel causative **myakkamuRuttu* ‘cause to become unconscious’.

Differences between morphological causativization and periphrastic causativization

We have already noted that there is some amount of difference between the morphological causativization and periphrastic causativiation. The periphrastic causatives formed by cey and vai_1 in some contexts imply some amount of force, whereas the causatives formed by morphological formation do not imply force. One can claim that the morphological causatives preferably express direct causation in which the subject is directly involved in causing the action denoted by the main verb, whereas periphrastic causatives can express indirect causation in which the subject is indirectly involved in causing the action denoted by the main verb. Usually, the periphrastic causativization denotes a general causative situation of ‘cause to V’ where as their counter part by morphological process denotes a specific causative situation.

4. Conclusion

We understand that Tamil undergoes two types of causation, one is morphological causation and the other periphrastic causation. The morphological causation involves suffixation or phonological change in the final consonants of the intransitive verbal bases. There are instances where causative verbs are formed

from the non-causative verbs by mere selection of tense markers. Rarely no distinction is made between causative and non-causative verbs. Only context will tell whether a particular verb is in causative or non-causative form. The periphrastic causative verbs are formed by the addition of certain verbs of causing such as cey 'do' and *vai* 'keep' to the infinitive form of the concerned verb. Lesser causative force is made by adding the verbs *viTu* 'leave', *pooTu* 'put' and *tuuNTu* 'provoke' to the infinitive form of the concerned verb.

Bibliography

Arad, M. 2002. Hebrew Lexical Causatives. In: Ouhalla, J., Shlonsky, U. (eds) Themes in Arabic and Hebrew Syntax. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, vol 53. Springer, Dordrecht.

Dixon, R.M.W. 2000. "A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning". In Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000) p. 30–83.

Comrie, B. 1976. "The syntax of causative constructions: cross-language similarities and divergencies." pp. 261–312. In Shibantani 1976.

Comrie, B. 1981. Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. p.158–177

Rajendran, S. 1979. "A Note on causativization in Tamil." In: Collection of papers presented in Eleventh Seminar-Conference, All India University Tamil Teachers' Association, Osmania University, Hyderabad.

Shibatani, M., ed. 2001. The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Song, J.J. (1996). Causatives and causation: A universal-typological perspective. London and New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Talmy, L. 2000. Toward a Cognitive Semantics Volume 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring. Cambridge: MIT Press. p.67–101

Wikipedia on “causativization”.